

provides approximately 30 flight opportunities per year to space scientists involved in research relating to the upper atmosphere, plasma, physics, solar physics, planetary atmospheres, galactic astronomy, high energy astrophysics, and microgravity. The launch vehicles used are relatively small.

The proposed action and NASA's preferred alternative is the continued operation of the NASA SRP as presently managed. The DSEIS focuses on programmatic changes in the NASA SRP that have taken place since the original FEIS was issued in 1973 by deleting launch vehicles that are no longer used, adding new launch vehicles and systems currently being used, and reflecting changes in Federal and state environmental laws and regulations. The DSEIS addresses both the overall programmatic environmental impacts of the SRP and the site-specific environmental impacts at and in the area of the three principal domestic sounding rocket sites: Goddard space Flight Center/Wallops Flight Facility, Wallops Island, Virginia; Poker Flat Research Range, Fairbanks, Alaska; and White Sands Missile Range, White Sands, New Mexico.

**Benita A. Cooper,**

*Associate Administrator for Management Systems and Facilities.*

[FR Doc. 95-14362 Filed 6-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

[Notice 95-037]

### **Intent To Grant a Partially Exclusive License**

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to grant a patent license.

**SUMMARY:** NASA hereby gives notice of intent to grant DuPont Advanced Composites, P.O. Box 6108, Newark, DE 19714, a partially exclusive license to practice the inventions described in U.S. Patent Application Numbers 08/209,512 entitled "Phenylethynyl Terminated Imide Oligomers," which was filed on March 3, 1994; and 08/330,773 entitled "Imide Oligomers Endcapped with Phenylethynyl Phthalic Anhydrides and Polymers Therefrom," which was filed on October 28, 1994, both of which are assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The partially exclusive license will contain appropriate terms and conditions to be negotiated in

accordance with the Department of Commerce Licensing Regulations (37 CFR part 404). NASA will negotiate the final terms and conditions and grant the license unless, within 60 days of the date of this notice, the Director of Patent Licensing receives written objections to the grant, together with supporting documentation. The Director of Patent Licensing will review all written responses to the notice and then recommend to the Associate General Counsel (Intellectual Property) whether to grant the license.

**DATES:** Comments to the notice must be received by August 11, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Code GP, Washington, DC 20546.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Harry Lupuloff, NASA, Director of Patent Licensing at (202) 358-2041.

Dated: June 2, 1995.

**Edward A. Frankle,**  
*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 95-14312 Filed 6-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-395]

#### **South Carolina Electric & Gas Company; South Carolina Public Service Authority; Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-12, issued to South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority, (the licensee), for operation of the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in Fairfield County, South Carolina.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would allow the licensee to discontinue the seismic monitoring program (which includes a network of seismometers near the Monticello Reservoir) that was put in place to monitor the seismic activity associated with the impoundment of the Monticello Reservoir. The monitoring program is currently funded by the licensee and operated and maintained by the University of South Carolina.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for

amendment dated March 6, 1955, as supplemented May 5, 1995.

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action was requested because the licensee believes that the burden and costs of the seismic monitoring program for reservoir induced seismicity are no longer justified.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The licensee's proposal will allow the seismic monitoring equipment to be permanently removed from current locations. This equipment is portable and is located around the Monticello Reservoir. The equipment is used solely for monitoring seismic activity around the reservoir and is not used for the operation of the plant. Based on the licensee's submittals and the discussions with other agencies and persons, the staff found that the removal of this equipment will have no significant impact on the environment.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar since the proposed amendment will allow the licensee to remove the seismic monitoring equipment and the licensee's present license condition does not prohibit the licensee from removing and relocating the seismic monitoring equipment from